

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
EASTERN DIVISION

REGINALD WILLIAMS,	)	CASE NO. 1:20-cv-805
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	JUDGE BRIDGET M. BRENNAN
v.	)	
	)	
WARDEN JEFF NOBLE,	)	<b><u>ORDER ADOPTING REPORT</u></b>
	)	<b><u>AND RECOMMENDATION</u></b>
Defendant.	)	

Before the Court is Magistrate Judge Jonathan D. Greenberg's Report and Recommendation (the "R & R") (Doc. No. 19), which recommends that the Court deny Plaintiff Reginald Williams' Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (Doc. No. 1) and dismiss the claims asserted therein. The R & R was filed on August 25, 2022, and a copy was mailed to Rodriguez that day.

Under the relevant statute, "[w]ithin fourteen days after being served with a copy, any party may serve and file written objections to such proposed findings and recommendations as provided by rules of court." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). When objections are made to a magistrate judge's report and recommendation, the district court reviews the case *de novo* and makes a "determination upon the record, or after additional evidence, of any portion of the magistrate judge's disposition to which specific written objection has been made in accordance with this rule." Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). Thereafter, the district judge "may accept, reject, or modify the recommended decision, receive further evidence, or recommit the matter to the magistrate judge with instructions. *Id.*

The failure to timely file written objections to a magistrate judge's report and

recommendation constitutes a waiver of the right to obtain a *de novo* review of the report and recommendation in the district court. *United States v. Walter*, 638 F.2d 947, 949-50 (6th Cir. 1981); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149-50 (1985). The failure to file written objections also results in a waiver of the right to appeal. *Thomas v. Arn*, 728 F.2d 813, 814-15 (6th Cir. 1984), *aff'd*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985).

Here, the deadline for objections has long passed, and no objections to the R & R have been filed. Nevertheless, this Court has reviewed the thorough R & R and agrees with Magistrate Judge Greenberg's conclusions that each of Plaintiff's claims are noncognizable, procedurally defaulted, and/or meritless.

Accordingly, the Court ADOPTS the R & R (Doc. No. 19) in full. Plaintiff's claims are DISMISSED with prejudice, and the Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (Doc. No. 1) is DENIED in its entirety with prejudice. The Court further certifies that an appeal from this decision could not be taken in good faith and that there is no basis upon which to issue a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(a)(3), 2253(c); Fed. R. App. P. 22(b).

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Date: October 5, 2022



---

BRIDGET MEEHAN BRENNAN  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE